arXiv:1703.08886v1 [math.DG] 26 Mar 2017

Constant scalar curvature hypersurfaces in $(3+1)$-dimensional GHMC Minkowski spacetimes.

26th March 2017

Graham Smith

Instituto de Matemática,
UFRJ, Av. Athos da Silveira Ramos 149,
Centro de Tecnologia - Bloco C,
Cidade Universitária - Ilha do Fundão,
Caixa Postal 68530, 21941-909,
Rio de Janeiro, RJ - BRASIL

Abstract: We prove that every $(3+1)$-dimensional flat GHMC Minkowski spacetime carries a unique foliation by spacelike hypersurfaces of constant scalar curvature. In other-words, we prove that every such spacetime carries a unique time function with isochrones of constant scalar curvature. Furthermore, this time function is smooth.

Key Words: Minkowski spactimes, GHMC, scalar curvature

AMS Subject Classification: 53C21, 53C50, 53C42, 52A20, 35J60

1 - Introduction.

1.1 - Introduction. Let $\mathbb{R}^{d,1}$ denote $(d+1)$-dimensional Minkowski space, that is $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ furnished with the semi-riemannian metric

$$ds^2 := dx_1^2 + ... + dx_d^2 - dx_{d+1}^2.$$

For the purposes of this paper, a $(d+1)$-dimensional *Minkowski spacetime* is a semi-riemannian manifold X which is everywhere locally isometric to $\mathbb{R}^{d,1}$. Minkowski spacetimes are of interest in cosmology as the simplest possible solutions of Einstein's equations. However, since the pioneering work [21] of Mess, they have also found deep and broad applications in the study of Teichmüller theory and its higher-dimensional analogous.

In this paper, we will be concerned with time functions defined over certain types of Minkowski spacetimes known as GHMC Minkowski spacetimes (see below). Here, a *time function* is defined to be a real-valued submersion all of whose level sets are spacelike. It is often possible to construct time functions which have interesting geometric properties and these, in turn, can be useful in studying the physics or the geometry of the ambient spacetime. For example, in [1], Andersson, Barbot, Béguin & Zeghib study smooth time-functions over constant curvature* GHMC spacetimes with level sets of constant mean curvature, thus proving the existence over such spacetimes of so-called "York" time functions, which are known to be of considerable use in general relativity. Likewise, in [3] and [4], Barbot et al. construct smooth time functions over $(2+1)$-dimensional Minkowski and anti de-Sitter GHMC spacetimes with level sets of constant extrinsic curvature, and in [9] and [10], Bonsante, Mondello & Schlenker use these time functions to provide deep new insights into the earthquake and grafting maps of classical Teichmüller theory. We refer the interested reader to our review [13] for more details of these and other related constructions.

In contrast to the above mentioned results, in [8], Bonsante & Fillastre show that smooth time functions with level sets of constant extrinsic curvature do not always exist for higher dimensional ambient spacetimes. This can be understood as a manifestation of the subtle manner in which constant extrinsic curvature is actually a uniformly elliptic condition for surfaces, but is no longer so in higher dimensions. For this reason, in [24], the author introduced the so-called "special lagrangian curvature" which, by involving the Calabi-Yau structure of the tangent bundle of the ambient space, yields an alternative generalisation of extrinsic curvature which continues to be elliptic even in higher dimensions. In particular, when the ambient spacetime is $(3+1)$-dimensional, the "special lagrangian curvature" of any spacelike hypersurfaces is none other than its *scalar curvature* which, we recall, is defined over a riemannian manifold M by

$$S := \frac{-1}{m(m-1)} g^{ik} R_{ijk}{}^{j},$$

where m here denotes the dimension of M, g denotes its metric, R denotes its Riemann curvature tensor, and the summation convention is implied.† Using this curvature notion, in

* that is, de-Sitter, Minkowski and anti de-Sitter.

† The normalisation is chosen here so that the scalar curvature of the unit sphere in Euclidean space is equal to 1.

[24], the author partially complements the work [1] of Andersson, Barbot, Béguin & Zeghib by constructing smooth time functions over open subsets of de-Sitter GHMC spacetimes with level sets of constant scalar curvature. In the present work, we extend this result to the Minkowski case, that is, we construct smooth time functions over $(3+1)$-dimensional GHMC Minkowski spacetimes with level sets of constant scalar curvature.

Before stating the main result of this paper, it is necessary to properly introduce the class of GHMC Minkowski spacetimes. Although this class arises from fairly natural physical considerations, it is nonetheless rather unfamiliar to most geometers, and its definition therefore requires a brief detour. We begin with the concept of causality. A tangent vector of X is said to be *spacelike*, *timelike* or *null* according to whether its norm-squared is positive, negative or null respectively, and is said to be *causal* whenever it is either timelike or null. A continuously differentiable, embedded curve in X is said to be *causal* whenever all of its tangent vectors are causal. Finally, the spacetime X is itself said to be *causal* whenever it contains no closed causal curve. This condition reflects the physical requirement that it is not possible to move into the past by travelling into the future.

We henceforth suppose that X is oriented, time-oriented and causal. The *past* of any given point x of X is then defined to be the closed set of all initial points of future-oriented, causal curves terminating in x. Likewise, the *future* of that point is defined to be the closed set of all terminal points of future-oriented, causal curves starting at x. The spacetime X is said to be *globally hyperbolic* whenever the intersection of the past of any point with the future of any other point is compact (c.f. [5] and [6]).

A *Cauchy hypersurface* in X is a spacelike hypersurface Σ which intersects every inextensible causal curve exactly once. In [5] and [6], Bernal & Sanchez show that an oriented and time-oriented spacetime is globally hyperbolic if and only if it contains a smooth Cauchy hypersurface. Although the Cauchy hypersurface is trivially not unique, all smooth Cauchy hypersurfaces of a given globally hyperbolic spacetime are diffeomorphic to one another, and the spacetime itself is diffeomorphic to the Cartesian product of any such hypersurface with $\mathbb{R}$. A globally hyperbolic spacetime is said to be *Cauchy compact* whenever its Cauchy hypersurface is compact.

Finally, a globally hyperbolic spacetime X is said to be *maximal* whenever there exists no isometric embedding e of X into a strictly larger spacetime $\tilde{X}$ such that the image under e of a Cauchy hypersurface in X is also a Cauchy hypersurface in $\tilde{X}$. In order to understand this property, consider the future cone in $\mathbb{R}^{d,1}$,

$$\mathrm{C} := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^{d,1} \mid \|x\|^2 < 0,\ x_{d+1} > 0 \right\}.$$

This space is globally hyperbolic and maximal, even though it isometrically embeds into the strictly larger space $\mathbb{R}^{d,1}$. Indeed, its Cauchy hypersurface is given by

$$\Sigma := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^{d,1} \mid \|x\|^2 = -1,\ x_{d+1} > 0 \right\},$$

which is not a Cauchy hypersurface of $\mathbb{R}^{d,1}$.

We say that an oriented and time oriented spacetime is *GHMC* whenever it is Globally Hyperbolic, Maximal and Cauchy-compact. We prove

Theorem 1.1.1

Let X be a (3+1)-dimensional GHMC Minkowski spacetime. There exists a unique smooth submersion $T : X \to]0, \infty[$ such that, for all $t \in]0, \infty[$, the level set $T^{-1}(\{t\})$ is a locally strictly convex Cauchy hypersurface of constant scalar curvature equal to $(-t^2)$.

Remark: Theorem 1.1.1 follows immediately from Theorem 3.4.1, below.

Remark: In fact, Theorem 1.1.1 readily generalizes to arbitrary dimensions. However, since the "special lagrangian curvature" has, to date, no clear geometric significance in higher dimensions, we shall not discuss this further here.

The author is grateful to François Fillastre for long and enlightening conversations on the subject of semi-riemannian geometry, without which this work would not have been realized.

2 - Special legendrian geometry.

2.1 - Real special lagrangian structures. The proof of Theorem 1.1.1 depends on a compactness result for families of hypersurfaces of constant scalar curvature. This result itself depends on the special legendrian structure of the bundle of future-oriented, unit, timelike tangent vectors over $\mathbb{R}^{d,1}$. In order to understand this structure, we first consider the fully integrable case.

Denote by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ the Minkowski metric over $\mathbb{R}^{d,1}$, that is

$$\langle U, V \rangle = U^1 V^1 + ... + U^d V^d - U^{d+1} V^{d+1}.$$

Consider the following structures defined over the cartesian product $\mathbb{R}^{d,1} \times \mathbb{R}^{d,1}$.

$$\begin{aligned} \omega((U_r, U_i), (V_r, V_i)) &:= \langle U_r, V_i \rangle - \langle V_r, U_i \rangle, \\ \mathrm{J}(U_r, U_i) &:= (-U_i, U_r), \text{ and} \\ \mathrm{R}(U_r, U_i) &:= (U_r, -U_i). \end{aligned}$$

The form ω is the symplectic form, and the maps J and R are, respectively, the complex and real structures. In particular,

$$\mathrm{JR} + \mathrm{RJ} = 0.$$

We call the structure defined by the triple $(\omega, \mathrm{J}, \mathrm{R})$ a *real special lagrangian structure*. Its symmetry group is given by the action of $\mathrm{O}(d, 1)$ on $\mathbb{R}^{d,1} \times \mathbb{R}^{d,1}$ which for any matrix M maps the pair (U_r, U_i) to the pair (MU_r, MU_i).

The real special lagrangian structure yields various auxiliary structures which play an important role in the sequel. There is a semi-riemannian metric, given by

$$g((U_r, U_i), (V_r, V_i)) := \omega((U_r, U_i), \mathrm{J}(V_r, V_i)) = \langle U_r, V_r \rangle + \langle U_i, V_i \rangle.$$

There is a Minkowski metric of signature $(d+1, d+1)$ given by

$$m((U_r, U_i), (V_r, V_i)) := -\omega((U_r, U_i), \mathrm{R}(V_r, V_i)) = \langle U_r, V_i \rangle + \langle V_r, U_i \rangle.$$

In particular, over every lagrangian subspace of $\mathbb{R}^{d,1} \times \mathbb{R}^{d,1}$, m satisfies

$$m((U_r, U_i), (V_r, V_i)) := \frac{1}{2}\langle U_r, V_i\rangle = \frac{1}{2}\langle V_r, U_i\rangle.$$

Finally, there is, up to a choice of sign, a unique complex $(d+1)$-form (complex with respect to the structure J) whose restriction to the real subspace $\mathbb{R}^{d,1} \times \{0\}$ coincides with the volume form of the metric g. This form, which we denote by $\hat{\Omega}$ is also described explicitly as follows. Let $e_1, ..., e_{d+1}$ be an orthonormal basis* of $\mathbb{R}^{d,1}$ and, for all k, denote $f_k := \mathrm{J}e_k$. Let $e^1, ..., e^{d+1}, f^1, ..., f^{d+1}$ be the basis dual to $e_1, ..., e_{d+1}, f_1, ..., f_{d+1}$ and, for all k, denote

$$dz^k := e^k + if^k.$$

It follows from the definitions that

$$\hat{\Omega} = \pm dz^1 \wedge ... \wedge dz^{d+1}.$$

In particular, $\hat{\Omega}$ is independent of the orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{R}^{d,1}$ chosen.

Lemma 2.1.1

(1) The restriction of g to any lagrangian subspace of $\mathbb{R}^{d,1} \times \mathbb{R}^{d,1}$ has signature $(d, 1)$.

(2) If $e_1, ..., e_{d+1}$ is an orthonormal basis of some lagrangian subspace of $\mathbb{R}^{d,1} \times \mathbb{R}^{d,1}$, then

$$\left|\hat{\Omega}(e_1, ..., e_{d+1})\right| = 1.$$

Proof: Let E be a lagrangian subspace of $\mathbb{R}^{d,1} \times \mathbb{R}^{d,1}$ and denote $F := \mathrm{J}E$. Observe that $E \cap F = \{0\}$, so that $\mathbb{R}^{d,1} \times \mathbb{R}^{d,1} = E \oplus F$. Furthermore, F is also lagrangian. It follows that the restrictions of g to E and F are non-degenerate for, otherwise, the symplectic form ω would be degenerate. Finally, J restricts to an isometry from E to F with respect to the metric g. Consequently, if the restriction of g to E has signature (p, q), then so too does its restriction to F. Since E and F are mutually orthogonal, (1) now follows.

Let A be any isometry sending E into the real subspace $\mathbb{R}^{d,1} \times \{0\}$. This map extends to a unique unitary map of $\mathbb{R}^{d,1} \times \mathbb{R}^{d,1}$ to itself. In particular,

$$\left|\hat{\Omega}(e_1, ..., e_{d+1})\right| = \left|\hat{\Omega}(Ae_1, ..., Ae_{d+1})\right|.$$

However, if $e_1, ..., e_{d+1}$ is an orthonormal basis of E, then $Ae_1, ..., Ae_{d+1}$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{R}^{d,1} \times \{0\}$ so that, by definition,

$$\hat{\Omega}(Ae_1, ..., Ae_{d+1}) = \pm 1,$$

and (2) follows. □

* Since the metric of $\mathbb{R}^{d,1}$ has signature $(d, 1)$, we take this to mean that e_1,...,e_d are spatial and e_{d+1} is temporal.

Corollary 2.1.2

If L is a lagrangian subspace over which

$$Im\left(e^{i\theta}\hat{\Omega}\right) = 0$$

for some θ then, for any orthonormal basis $e_1, ..., e_{d+1}$ of L,

$$Re\left(e^{i\theta}\hat{\Omega}(e_1, ..., e_{d+1})\right) = \pm 1.$$

2.2 - The real special legendrian structure. Let $\mathrm{U}^+\mathbb{R}^{d,1}$ denote the bundle of future-oriented, unit, timelike tangent vectors over $\mathbb{R}^{d,1}$. Let M denote its total space, that is

$$M := \mathrm{U}^+\mathbb{R}^{d,1} = \left\{(x, y) \mid \|y\|^2 = -1,\ y_{d+1} > 0\right\}.$$

The tangent space to M at the point (x, y) is given by

$$T_{(x,y)}M = \{(U_r, U_i) \mid \langle U_i, y\rangle = 0\}.$$

Observe now that the symplectic form ω defined in Section 2.1 is the exterior derivative of the Liouville form

$$\lambda_{(x,y)}(U_r, U_i) := \langle U_r, y\rangle.$$

The restriction of λ to TM makes M into a contact manifold. In particular, the fibre of its contact bundle over a given point (x, y) is given by

$$\alpha_{(x,y)} = \{(U_r, U_i) \mid \langle U_r, y\rangle = \langle U_i, y\rangle = 0\}.$$

Since the maps J and R both preserve α they define, together with $\omega := d\lambda$, a real special lagrangian structure over every fibre of α. We say that the manifold M carries a *real special legendrian structure*. Of particular significance will be the real and imaginary subspaces of $\alpha_{(x,y)}$ given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_{(x,y)} &:= \{U \mid U = \mathrm{R}U\} = \{(U, 0) \mid \langle U, y\rangle = 0\}, \text{ and} \\ \mathcal{I}_{(x,y)} &:= \{U \mid U = -\mathrm{R}U\} = \{(0, U) \mid \langle U, y\rangle = 0\}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

Observe that, from the point of view of the unitary bundle, $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{I}$ are respectively the horizontal and vertical subspaces of α. Furthermore, each of these spaces naturally identifies with the orthogonal complement of y in $\mathbb{R}^{d,1}$ and, in particular, they each identify with one another.

The forms g and m are defined over each fibre of α as before. Significantly, over each fibre, g now defines a riemannian metric, and m defines a metric of signature (d, d). Let Ω denote the unique (up to choice of sign) complex d-form which coincides with the volume form of the metric g over the subspace

$$\mathcal{R}_{(x,y)} = \{(U, 0) \mid \langle U, y\rangle = 0\}.$$

It is straightforward to show that at every point (x, y) of M,

$$\Omega_{(x,y)} = \pm c_{(y,0)}\hat{\Omega},$$

where $c_{(y,0)}$ here denotes the operator of contraction by the vector $(y, 0)$.

Let D denote the standard differentiation operator over $\mathbb{R}^{d,1} \times \mathbb{R}^{d,1}$ restricted to M. Let $\overline{\nabla}$ denote its composition with orthogonal projection onto the distribution α. Let $U := (U_r, U_i)$ and $V := (V_r, V_i)$ be tangent vector fields over M taking values in α. Recalling that $(y, 0)$ and $(0, y)$ are temporal vectors, and therefore have negative norm-squared, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{\nabla}_U V &= D_U V + \langle (y,0), D_U V\rangle (y,0) + \langle (0,y), D_U V\rangle (0,y) \\ &= D_U V - \langle V, D_U(y,0)\rangle (y,0) - \langle V, D_U(0,y)\rangle (0,y) \\ &= D_U V - \langle V_r, U_i\rangle (y,0) - \langle V_i, U_i\rangle (0,y).\end{aligned}$$

The *shape operator* of α is defined to be the difference between D and $\overline{\nabla}$, that is

$$\overline{A}_U V := D_U V - \overline{\nabla}_U V = \langle V_r, U_i\rangle (y,0) + \langle V_i, U_i\rangle (0,y).$$

The curvature of the distribution α is then given by

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \overline{R}_{XY} Z, W\rangle &= \langle \overline{\mathrm{A}}_X W, \overline{\mathrm{A}}_Y Z\rangle - \langle \overline{\mathrm{A}}_X Z, \overline{\mathrm{A}}_Y W\rangle \\ &= -\langle W_r, X_i\rangle\langle Z_r, Y_i\rangle - \langle W_i, X_i\rangle\langle Z_i, Y_i\rangle \\ &\quad + \langle Z_r, X_i\rangle\langle W_r, Y_i\rangle + \langle Z_i, X_i\rangle\langle W_i, Y_i\rangle,\end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

where X, Y, Z and W are vectors in α. This formula will play an important role in the calculations that follow.

Finally, straightforward calculations show that for all vectors U in α,

$$(\overline{\nabla}\mathrm{J})U = (\overline{\nabla}\mathrm{R})U = 0,$$

for all vectors U and V in α,

$$(\overline{\nabla} g)(U, V) = (\overline{\nabla}\omega)(U, V) = (\overline{\nabla} m)(U, V) = 0,$$

and for all vectors $X, U_1, ..., U_d$ in α,

$$(\overline{\nabla}_X \Omega)(U_1, ..., U_d) = 0.$$

2.3 - Special legendrian submanifolds. Let $\Sigma \subseteq M$ be a d-dimensional embedded submanifold. We say that Σ is *legendrian* whenever its tangent space is always contained in α and

$$\omega|_{T\Sigma} = 0.$$

Let ∇ be the Levi-Civita covariant derivative of Σ. The shape operator A of Σ is defined by

$$A_U V := \overline{\nabla}_U V - \nabla_U V,$$

where U and V are tangent vector fields over Σ. Observe, in particular, that $A_U V$ is always normal to Σ. The second fundamental form of Σ is given by

$$\mathrm{II}(U, V, W) := \langle A_U V, \mathrm{J}W \rangle = \omega(A_U V, W).$$

In particular, since Σ is legendrian, II is symmetric in all three variables.

For $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, we say that the legendrian submanifold Σ is *θ-special legendrian* whenever

$$\mathrm{Im}(e^{i\theta}\Omega)|_{T\Sigma} = 0,$$

and we call θ the *special legendrian angle* of Σ.

Lemma 2.3.1

If Σ is θ-special legendrian for some θ then, for any orthonormal basis $e_1, ..., e_d$ of $T\Sigma$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d} II(\cdot, e_i, e_i) = 0.$$

In particular, Σ is minimal.

Proof: Indeed, consider a point p in Σ. Let $e_1, ..., e_d$ be an orthonormal basis of $T_p\Sigma$ and extend this to a frame which is parallel at p. For any other tangent vector U to Σ at p,

$$\begin{aligned} U\Omega(e_1, ..., e_d) &= (\overline{\nabla}_U \Omega)(e_1, ..., e_d) + \sum_{i=1}^{d} \Omega(e_1, ..., \overline{\nabla}_U e_i, ..., e_d) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{d} \Omega(e_1, ..., \mathrm{A}_U e_i, ..., e_d), \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows since e_i is parallel at p for all i. Since $A_U e_i$ is normal to $T_p\Sigma$ for all i, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} U\Omega(e_1, ..., e_d) &= \sum_{i,j=1}^{d} \Omega(e_1, ..., \langle A_U e_i, \mathrm{J}e_j \rangle \mathrm{J}e_j, ..., e_d) \\ &= i \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d} \mathrm{II}(U, e_i, e_i) \right) \Omega(e_1, ..., e_d), \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows since Ω is $\mathbb{C}$-multilinear. Taking the imaginary parts now yields

$$\begin{aligned} U\mathrm{Im}(e^{i\theta}\Omega(e_1,...,e_d)) &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d}\mathrm{II}(U,e_i,e_i)\right)\mathrm{Re}(e^{i\theta}\Omega(e_1,...,e_d)) \\ &= \pm\sum_{i=1}^{d}\mathrm{II}(U,e_i,e_i), \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality here follows by Corollary 2.1.2. □

2.4 - Positive special legendrian submanifolds. We say that the special legendrian submanifold Σ is *positive* (strictly speaking, *non-negative*) whenever

$$m|_{T\Sigma} \geq 0.$$

Although this may seem like a strong restriction, positive special legendrian submanifolds arise quite naturally as lifts of certain hypersurfaces of $\mathbb{R}^{d,1}$. As such, they will play a key role in our study of constant scalar curvature hypersurfaces in $(3+1)$-dimensional Minkowski space. Indeed, recall that, by the Gauss-Codazzi equations, the scalar curvature of an embedded hypersurface in $\mathbb{R}^{3,1}$ is given by

$$S := -\frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1\lambda_2 + \lambda_1\lambda_3 + \lambda_2\lambda_3),$$

where λ_1, λ_2 and λ_3 are the principal curvatures of the hypersurface. We now have

Lemma 2.4.1

Let Σ be an embedded spacelike hypersurface in $\mathbb{R}^{3,1}$, let $N : \Sigma \to \mathbb{H}^3$ be its future-oriented, unit, normal vector field and define the embedded hypersurface $\hat{\Sigma}$ by

$$\hat{\Sigma} := \{(x, N(x)) \mid x \in \Sigma\}.$$

(1) $\hat{\Sigma}$ is legendrian;

(2) if Σ has constant scalar curvature equal to $(-1/3)$, then $\hat{\Sigma}$ is $\pi/2$-special legendrian;

(3) if Σ is complete, then so too is $\hat{\Sigma}$; and

(4) if Σ is locally strictly convex, then $\hat{\Sigma}$ is (strictly) positive.

Remark: In fact, an analogous result holds in all dimensions. For example, when $d = 2$, special legendrian submanifolds correspond to surfaces of constant extrinsic curvature. However, in higher dimensions, the relevant notion of curvature is more involved, and we refer the reader to [25] for details.

Proof: Consider a point x of Σ, denote $y := N(x)$ and denote $p := (x, y)$. Let $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{I}$ denote respectively the real and imaginary subspaces of $\alpha_{(x,y)}$ as defined in (2.1). Recall that both $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{I}$ identify with the orthogonal complement of y in $\mathbb{R}^{3,1}$, that is, the

tangent space to Σ at x. In particular, via this identification, $T_p\hat{\Sigma}$ itself identifies with the graph of the shape operator of Σ at x, which we now denote by A. For U and V tangent to Σ, we now have

$$\omega((U, AU), (V, AV)) = \langle U, AV\rangle - \langle AU, V\rangle = 0,$$

so that $\hat{\Sigma}$ is legendrian. This proves (1). Next, we have

$$\mathrm{Det}(\mathrm{Id} + iA) = 1 + i\mathrm{Tr}(A) - \sigma_2(A) - i\mathrm{Det}(A),$$

so that $\mathrm{Im}(e^{i\pi/2}\mathrm{Det}(\mathrm{Id} + iA))$ vanishes whenever $\sigma_2(A) = 1$. This proves (2). The metric over $\hat{\Sigma}$ is given by

$$\langle (U, AU), (V, AV)\rangle = \langle U, V\rangle + \langle AU, AV\rangle,$$

so that $\hat{\Sigma}$ is complete whenever Σ is. This proves (3). Finally,

$$m((U, AU), (V, AV)) = 2\langle U, AV\rangle,$$

so that m is positive definite whenever A is positive definite. This proves (4). $\square$

Significantly, the hypothesis of positivity makes it straightforward to prove strong compactness results for special legendrian submanifolds. However, in order to state these results, we first require some terminology. Thus, a *pointed*, embedded submanifold is defined to be a pair (Σ, p) where Σ is an embedded submanifold and p is a point of Σ. A sequence (Σ_m, p_m) of complete, pointed, embedded submanifolds is said to *converge* towards the complete, pointed, embedded submanifold $(\Sigma_\infty, p_\infty)$ whenever there exists a sequence (ϕ_m) of smooth maps from Σ_∞ into M with the following properties.

(1) $\phi_m(p_\infty) = p_m$ for all m; and

for every compact subset K of N_∞, there exists $m_0 \geq 0$ such that

(2) for all $m \geq m_0$, ϕ_m defines an embedding over K whose image is contained in Σ_m; and

(3) the subsequence $(\phi_m)_{m\geq m_0}$ converges in the C^∞ sense over K to the identity map.

In [25], we prove the following compactness theorem.

Theorem 2.4.2

Let (θ_m) be a sequence of real numbers converging to θ_∞. For all m, let (Σ_m, p_m) be a complete, pointed, positive, θ_m-special legendrian submanifold of M. If there exists a compact subset K of M such that $p_m \in K$ for all m, then there exists a complete, pointed, positive, θ_∞-special legendrian submanifold $(\Sigma_\infty, p_\infty)$ towards which (Σ_m, p_m) subconverges in the sense described above.

2.5 - Degenerate submanifolds. We say that a positive special legendrian submanifold is *degenerate* at the point p whenever $m(U_p, U_p)$ vanishes for some tangent vector U_p. We say that it is *degenerate* whenever it is degenerate at some point, and we say that it is *totally degenerate* whenever it is degenerate at every point. We now establish conditions under which any degenerate special legendrian submanifold is totally degenerate. This will yield a refinement of Theorem 2.4.2 to a compactness result for hypersurfaces of constant scalar curvature in Minkowski space. First, we define the function $\phi : \Sigma \to [0, \infty[$ by

$$\phi(p) := \operatorname*{Inf}_{\|U_p\|=1} m(U_p, U_p).$$

The following lemma will prove useful.

Lemma 2.5.1

Let p be a point in M, and let E be a legendrian subspace of α_p. There exists a unit vector $U \in E$ such that

(1) U minimises $m(U, U)$ amongst all unit vectors in E; and

(2) for any vector V in E, orthogonal to U,

$$m(U, V) = m(U, JV) = 0.$$

Proof: Let $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{I}$ be the real and imaginary subspaces of α_p, as defined in (2.1). Upon perturbing E if necessary, we may suppose that it is the graph over $\mathcal{R}$ of some linear map $A : \mathcal{R} \to \mathcal{I}$. Since E is legendrian, this linear map is symmetric. Now let $\pi : E \to \mathcal{R}$ be the projection along $\mathcal{I}$. We have

$$\pi_* g(\cdot, \cdot) = \langle (\mathrm{Id} + A^2)\cdot, \cdot \rangle.$$

Likewise,

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_* m(\cdot, \cdot) &= \pi_* g(M\cdot, \cdot), \text{ and} \\ \pi_* m(\cdot, \mathrm{J}\cdot) &= \pi_* g(N\cdot, \cdot), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} M &= 2A(\mathrm{Id} + A^2)^{-1}, \text{ and} \\ N &= (\mathrm{Id} - A^2)(\mathrm{Id} + A^2)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Since these matrices commute with one another and are both symmetric with respect to $\pi_* g$, the result now follows upon chosing U such that $\pi_*(U)$ is a joint eigenvector of M and N with minimal eigenvalue for M. $\square$

Lemma 2.5.2

If Σ is positive, then there exists a continuous function f such that

$$\Delta\phi + f\phi \leq -Tr(m)\langle U_i, U_i\rangle m(U, JU), \tag{2.3}$$

in the viscosity sense, where U is as in Lemma 2.5.1 and $U =: (U_r, U_i)$.

Proof: Choose $p \in \Sigma$. Let $U \in T_p\Sigma$ be as in Lemma 2.5.1 and extend U to a unit vector field in a neighbourhood of p which is parallel along geodesics leaving p. In particular, $\phi \leq m(U, U)$ and $\phi(p) = m(U(p), U(p))$, so that it suffices to prove the differential relation for the function $m(U, U)$. Let $e_1, ..., e_d$ be an orthonormal basis of $T_p\Sigma$ such that $e_1 = U$, and extend this to an orthonormal frame field in a neighbourhood of p which is parallel at p.

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta m(U,U) &= \sum_{k=1}^{d} e_k e_k m(U,U) \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{d} 2e_k m\left(\overline{\nabla}_{e_k} U, U\right) \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{d} 2m\left(\overline{\nabla}_{e_k}\overline{\nabla}_{e_k} U, U\right) + 2m\left(\overline{\nabla}_{e_k} U, \overline{\nabla}_{e_k} U\right) \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{d} 2m\left(\nabla_{e_k}\nabla_{e_k} U + \mathrm{A}_{e_k}\nabla_{e_k} U + \overline{\nabla}_{e_k}\mathrm{A}_{e_k} U, U\right) + 2m\left(\mathrm{A}_{e_k} U, \mathrm{A}_{e_k} U\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, since U is parallel along geodesics leaving p,

$$\Delta m(U,U) = \sum_{k=1}^{d} 2m\left(\overline{\nabla}_{e_k}\mathrm{A}_{e_k} U, U\right) + 2m\left(\mathrm{A}_{e_k} U, \mathrm{A}_{e_k} U\right).$$

Furthermore, since Σ is positive, m is non-positive over $\mathrm{J}T_p\Sigma$, and so

$$\Delta m(U,U) \leq \sum_{k=1}^{d} 2m\left(\overline{\nabla}_{e_k}\mathrm{A}_{e_k} U, U\right).$$

Now, by definition of U,

$$m(U, V) = m(U, \mathrm{J}V) = 0,$$

for all V orthogonal to U. Thus

$$\Delta m(U,U) \leq \sum_{k=1}^{d} 2\langle\overline{\nabla}_{e_k}\mathrm{A}_{e_k} U, U\rangle m(U,U) + 2\langle\overline{\nabla}_{e_k}\mathrm{A}_{e_k} U, \mathrm{J}U\rangle m(\mathrm{J}U, U),$$

and since $\langle A_{e_k}U, \mathrm{J}A_{e_k}U\rangle = 0$ for all k, this yields,

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta m(U,U) &= \sum_{k=1}^{d}(-2)\langle \mathrm{A}_{e_k}U, \mathrm{A}_{e_k}U\rangle m(U,U) + 2(\nabla_{e_k}\mathrm{II})(e_k,U,U)m(\mathrm{J}U,U)\\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{d}\Big[(-2)\langle \mathrm{A}_{e_k}U, \mathrm{A}_{e_k}U\rangle m(U,U)\\ &\qquad + 2(\nabla_U \mathrm{II})(e_k,e_k,U)m(\mathrm{J}U,U)\\ &\qquad + 2\langle \overline{R}_{e_kU}e_k, \mathrm{J}U\rangle m(\mathrm{J}U,U)\Big].\end{aligned}$$

The first term on the right hand side is now absorbed into $f\phi$. The second term vanishes by Lemma 2.3.1. It thus remains to study the last term on the right hand side. However, by (2.2), and using again the definition of U,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{k=1}^{d}\langle \overline{R}_{e_kU}e_k, \mathrm{J}U\rangle m(\mathrm{J}U,U) &= \sum_{k=1}^{d}(-1)\Big[\langle (\mathrm{J}U)_r, e_{k,i}\rangle\langle e_{k,r}, U_i\rangle\\ &\qquad + \langle (\mathrm{J}U)_i, e_{k,i}\rangle\langle e_{k,i}, U_i\rangle\Big]m(\mathrm{J}U,U)\\ &\qquad + \Big[\langle e_{k,r}, e_{k,i}\rangle\langle (\mathrm{J}U)_r, U_i\rangle\\ &\qquad + \langle e_{k,i}, e_{k,i}\rangle\langle (\mathrm{J}U)_i, U_i\rangle\Big]m(\mathrm{J}U,U)\\ &= \Big[\langle U_i, U_i\rangle\langle U_r, U_i\rangle\\ &\qquad - \langle U_r, U_i\rangle\langle U_i, U_i\rangle\Big]m(\mathrm{J}U,U)\\ &\qquad - \sum_{k=1}^{d}\langle e_{k,r}, e_{k,i}\rangle\langle U_i, U_i\rangle m(\mathrm{J}U,U)\\ &\qquad + \sum_{k=1}^{d}\langle e_{k,i}, e_{k,i}\rangle\langle U_r, U_i\rangle m(\mathrm{J}U,U)\\ &= -\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}(m)\langle U_i, U_i\rangle m(\mathrm{J}U,U)\\ &\qquad + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=1}^{d}\langle e_{k,i}, e_{k,i}\rangle m(\mathrm{J}U,U)m(U,U).\end{aligned}$$

The second term on the right hand side is absorbed into $f\phi$, and the result now follows. □

2.6 - Refining the special legendrian condition. It turns out that positive special legendrian submanifolds can be further subdivided into disjoint families, which then permits us control the sign on the right hand side of (2.3). Indeed, consider a point p of M, and let $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{I}$ be respectively the real and imaginary subspaces of α_p as defined in (2.1). Let E be a positive, legendrian subspace of α_p. Upon perturbing E slightly if necessary, we may suppose that it is the graph over $\mathcal{R}$ of some symmetric matrix $A : \mathcal{R} \to \mathcal{I}$. A straightforward calculation then shows that E is θ-special legendrian whenever,

$$\mathrm{Im}(e^{i\theta}\mathrm{Det}(\mathrm{Id} + iA)) = 0.$$

Thus, if $0 < \lambda_1 \leq ... \leq \lambda_d$ are the eigenvalues of A, then E is θ-special legendrian whenever

$$\Theta(E) := \sum_{i=1}^{d} \mathrm{Arctan}(\lambda_i) = -\theta \bmod \pi\mathbb{Z}.$$

The function Θ extends continuously to all positive special legendrian subspaces, including those that are not graphs, and subdivides the grassmannian of all such subspaces into distinct branches, characterised by the value of Θ.

Of particular interest to us will be the case where the special legendrian angle is equal to $\pi/2$. Here, we will be interested in the branch $\{\Theta = \pi/2\}$.

Lemma 2.6.1

Let E be a positive, special legendrian subspace of α_p. If $\Theta(E) = \pi/2$, and if $U \in E$ minimises $m(U, U)$ amongst all unit vectors, then

$$m(U, JU) \geq 0.$$

Proof: Indeed, upon perturbing E slightly if necessary, we may suppose that it is the graph of a positive definite, symmetric matrix A. If $0 < \lambda_1 \leq ... \leq \lambda_d$ are the eigenvalues of this matrix, then

$$0 < \sum_{i=1}^{d} \mathrm{Arctan}(\lambda_i) = \Theta(E) = \pi/2.$$

In particular,

$$\mathrm{Arctan}(\lambda_1) \leq \frac{\pi}{4},$$

and

$$\mathrm{Arctan}(\lambda_1) \leq \mathrm{Arctan}(\lambda_d) \leq \frac{\pi}{2} - \mathrm{Arctan}(\lambda_1),$$

so that

$$\lambda_1 \leq 1,$$

and

$$\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_d \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_1}.$$

Furthermore, $\lambda_d = 1/\lambda_1$ if and only if $d = 2$ and $\lambda_1 = \lambda_d = 1$. Now, if U minimises $m(U, U)$ amongst all unit vectors in E, then

$$U = \frac{1}{1+\lambda^2}(U_0, \lambda U_0),$$

for some unit eigenvector U_0 of A with eigenvalue λ, where λ is equal either to λ_1 or to λ_d. However,

$$m(U, U) = \frac{2\lambda}{1+\lambda^2},$$

and a straightforward calculation shows that

$$\frac{2\lambda_d}{1+\lambda_d^2} \geq \frac{2\lambda_1}{1+\lambda_1^2} = \frac{2/\lambda_1}{1+1/\lambda_1^2}.$$

Consequently,

$$\lambda = \lambda_1 \leq 1,$$

so that,

$$\begin{aligned} m(U, \mathrm{J}U) &= \frac{1}{1+\lambda_1^2} m((e_1, \lambda e_1), (-\lambda e_1, e_1)) \\ &= \frac{1-\lambda_1^2}{1+\lambda_1^2} \\ &\geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

as desired. □

Corollary 2.6.2

Let Σ be a positive, $\pi/2$-special legendrian submanifold of M. If $\Theta = \pi/2$ over Σ then there exists a continuous function $f : \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\Delta\phi + f\phi \leq 0.$$

In particular, this yields the following alternative.

Theorem 2.6.3

Let Σ be a positive, $\pi/2$-special legendrian submanifold of M. If Σ is degenerate and if $\Theta = \pi/2$ over Σ then Σ is totally degenerate.

Proof: This follows immediately upon applying the strong maximum principle (Theorem 3.5 of [14], and the subsequent discussion) to ϕ. □

2.7 - The geometry of curtain submanifolds. Following [20], we refer to totally degenerate, positive, special legendrian submanifolds as *curtain submanifolds*. Being overdetermined, these submanifolds have quite straightforward geometric structures. A complete description of curtain submanifolds will permit us to adapt the compactness result of Theorem 2.4.2 to the study of constant scalar curvature surfaces in Minkowski space.

We first consider some simple examples. To this end, we identify the upper component of the unit pseudosphere in $\mathbb{R}^{d,1}$ with d-dimensional hyperbolic space, that is,

$$\mathbb{H}^d = \left\{ y \mid \|y\|^2 = -1,\ y_{d+1} > 0 \right\}.$$

We consider the total space of the tangent bundle over $\mathbb{H}^d$ as a submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^{d,1} \times \mathbb{R}^{d,1}$, that is

$$T\mathbb{H}^d = \left\{ (x,y) \mid \|y\|^2 = -1,\ y_{d+1} > 0,\ \langle x, y \rangle = 0 \right\}.$$

In particular, this is also a submanifold of M.

Consider now an embedded submanifold Σ in $\mathbb{H}^d$ and let $N\Sigma \subseteq T\mathbb{H}^d \subseteq X$ be the total space of its normal bundle, that is

$$N\Sigma := \{(x,y) \mid y \in \Sigma, x \perp T_y\Sigma\}.$$

Lemma 2.7.1

(1) $N\Sigma$ is a legendrian submanifold of X; and

(2) $N\Sigma$ is special legendrian if and only if Σ is totally geodesic.

Furthermore, when Σ is totally geodesic, $\Theta = m\pi/2$ over $N\Sigma$, where m is the dimension of Σ.

Proof: Let $0 \leq m < d$ be the dimension of Σ. Choose a point $(x,y) \in \Sigma$. Let $e_1, ..., e_m$ be an orthonormal basis of $T_y\Sigma$ and extend this to an orthonormal basis $e_1, ..., e_d$ of $T_y\mathbb{H}^d$. In particular $e_{m+1}, ..., e_d$ is an orthonormal basis of $N_y\Sigma$. A basis of $T_{(x,y)}N\Sigma$ is now given by

$$f_i := \begin{cases} (A(x,y)e_i, e_i) & \text{if } 1 \leq i \leq m, \text{ and} \\ (e_i, 0) & \text{if } m < i \leq d, \end{cases}$$

where, for all $(x,y) \in N\Sigma$, $A(x,y) : T_y\Sigma \to T_y\Sigma$ here denotes the shape operator of Σ at the point y with respect to the normal vector x. Since $e_1, ..., e_m$ are all normal to the position vector y, $TN\Sigma$ is contained in α. Since $A(x,y)$ is symmetric, $N\Sigma$ is legendrian. Finally, for all x and for all y,

$$\mathrm{Im}(e^{i\theta}\Omega)|_{TN\Sigma} = \pm \mathrm{Im}(e^{i\theta}\mathrm{Det}(A(x,y) + i\mathrm{Id}))\mathrm{dVol},$$

and since $A(x,y)$ is linear in x, this vanishes if and only if A vanishes identically. A straightforward calculation now yields the formula for Θ, and this completes the proof. □

We conclude by showing that there are no other curtain submanifolds of interest to us.

Theorem 2.7.2

The only complete, totally degenerate, positive, special legendrian submanifolds of M with $\Theta = \pi/2$ are those of the form $N\Gamma$, where Γ is a complete geodesic in $\mathbb{H}^d$.

Proof: Indeed, let Σ be a complete, totally degenerate, positive, special legendrian submanifold of M with $\Theta = \pi/2$. Let $\pi : \mathbb{R}^{d,1} \times \mathbb{R}^{d,1} \to \mathbb{R}^{d,1}$ be the projection onto the second factor. In particular, π projects the submanifold M into $\mathbb{H}^d$. We first claim that the restriction of $D\pi$ to $T\Sigma$ has non-trivial kernel at every point. Indeed, suppose the contrary. Consider a point $p \in \Sigma$ where $D\pi$ is injective, and let $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{I}$ be the real and imaginary subspaces of α_p as defined in (2.1). By injectivity, $T_p\Sigma$ is the graph of some matric $A : \mathcal{I} \to \mathcal{R}$. Since Σ is legendrian and positive, A is symmetric and non-negative semi-definite, and since Σ is special legendrian with $\Theta = \pi/2$, A is positive definite. In particular, m is non-vanishing at p, which is absurd, and it follows that $D\pi$ indeed has non-trivial kernel at every point, as asserted.

Let $p \in \Sigma$ minimise $\mathrm{Dim}(\mathrm{Ker}(D\pi))$. In particular, $\mathrm{Ker}(D\pi)$ has constant dimension near p, and therefore defines a distribution in a neighbourhood of this point. Furthermore, thinking of $D\pi$ as an $\mathbb{R}^{d,1}$-valued 1-form over Σ, we have $dD\pi = 0$, so that this distribution is integrable. Each leaf of the resulting foliation is contained in a fibre of the projection π. In summary, there exists, for some $1 \leq m \leq d$, an embedded, m-dimensional submanifold Σ' in $\mathbb{H}^d$ passing through $\pi(p)$, an $(d-m)$-dimensional manifold X and a smooth map $\Phi : X \times \Sigma' \to \Sigma$ which is a diffeomorphism onto its image such that, for all $q \in \Sigma'$, $L_q := \Phi(X^m \times \{q\})$ is contained in $\pi^{-1}(\{q\})$.

Consider now a point $q \in \Sigma'$, a point $\hat{q} \in L_q$, and a tangent vector X to L_q at this point. Consider L_q as a submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$. Since $T\Sigma$ is contained in α,

$$\langle X, q \rangle = 0.$$

Furthermore, since m is non-negative definite over Σ, and since $m(X, X) = 0$,

$$\langle X, Y \rangle = 0,$$

for all Y tangent to Σ' at q. Since $\mathrm{Dim}(L_q) + \mathrm{Dim}(\Sigma') + 1 = d + 1$, it follows that L_q is an open subset of

$$\{(X, q) \mid X \perp q,\ X \perp T_p\Sigma'\}.$$

Since q is arbitrary, we conclude that the image of Φ coincides with an open subset of $N\Sigma'$. It now follows by Lemma 2.7.1 that Σ' is totally geodesic and, by unique continuation (c.f. Lemma 2.3 of [25]), $N\Sigma'$ coincides with the whole of Σ. In particular, Σ' is complete, and this completes the proof. □

3 - Hypersurfaces in Minkowski spacetimes.

3.1 - Affine deformations. We furnish $\mathbb{R}^{d,1}$ with its canonical spatial and temporal orientations. Let $\mathrm{PSO}(d, 1)$ denote the group of linear isometries of $\mathbb{R}^{d,1}$ which preserve both of these orientations. Define the upper unit pseudo-sphere in $\mathbb{R}^{d,1}$ by

$$H_{-1} := \left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d,1} \mid \|x\|^2 = -1,\ x_{d+1} > 0\right\}.$$

Recall that the semi-riemannian metric of $\mathbb{R}^{d,1}$ restricts to a riemannian metric over H_{-1} which is complete and isometric to d-dimensional hyperbolic space $\mathbb{H}^d$. In particular, the group $\mathrm{PSO}(d,1)$ preserves H_{-1} and in this manner identifies with the group of orientation preserving isometries of $\mathbb{H}^d$. A subgroup Γ of $\mathrm{PSO}(d,1)$ is said to be *kleinian* whenever it is discrete, cocompact and torsion free. In particular, the quotient of $\mathbb{H}^d$ by a kleinian subgroup is a compact hyperbolic manifold and, conversely, given a compact hyperbolic manifold, its fundamental group identifies with some kleinian subgroup.

The group of affine isometries of $\mathbb{R}^{d,1}$ which preserve the spatial and temporal orientations is given by the semidirect product $\mathrm{PSO}(d,1) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^{d,1}$, where the group law is given by

$$(\alpha, x) \cdot (\beta, y) := (\alpha\beta, x + \alpha(y)).$$

Given a kleinian subgroup Γ, an *affine deformation* is a homomorphism $\rho : \Gamma \to \mathrm{PSO}(d,1) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^{d,1}$ of the form

$$\rho(\alpha) = (\alpha, \tau(\alpha)),$$

for some map $\tau : \Gamma \to \mathbb{R}^{d,1}$. The homomorphism property of ρ is equivalent to the *cocycle condition* on τ, namely

$$\tau(\alpha\beta) = \tau(\alpha) + \alpha\tau(\beta),$$

for all $\alpha, \beta \in \Gamma$. It follows that the set of affine deformations of Γ naturally identifies with the set of $\mathbb{R}^{d,1}$-cocycles over this group, which itself constitutes a finite-dimensional vector space. Throughout the sequel, by abuse of notation, we denote the image of ρ in $\mathrm{PSO}(d,1) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^{d,1}$ by $\Gamma \ltimes \tau$.

GHMC Minkowski spacetimes are parametrised by affine deformations as follows. First, recall that the future cone in $\mathbb{R}^{d,1}$ is given by

$$C := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^{d,1} \mid \|x\|^2 \leq 0,\ x_{d+1} \geq 0 \right\}.$$

We say that a closed, convex subset K of $\mathbb{R}^{d,1}$ is future-complete whenever

$$K + C := \{x + y \mid x \in K,\ y \in C\} \subseteq K.$$

In [7] Bonsante shows that, for any affine deformation $\Gamma \ltimes \tau$ of $\mathrm{PSO}(d,1) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^{d,1}$, there exists a unique future-complete, closed, convex subset K of $\mathbb{R}^{d,1}$ such that

(1) K is invariant under the action of $\Gamma \ltimes \tau$,

(2) $\Gamma \ltimes \tau$ acts properly discontinuously on the interior of K, and

(3) K is maximal with respect to inclusion amongst all future-complete, closed, convex subsets of $\mathbb{R}^{d,1}$ which satisfy (1) and (2).

The quotient $K^o/\Gamma \ltimes \tau$ is a GHMC Minkowski spacetime. Furthermore, up to a reversal of the temporal orientation, all GHMC Minkowski spacetimes arise in this manner (c.f. [7]). Throughout the sequel, we will refer to the set K as *Bonsante's domain* for τ.

Bonsante's result can also be interpreted as follows. Given a fixed kleinian subgroup Γ, there exists a set valued function K which maps every $\mathbb{R}^{d,1}$-cocycle τ over Γ to Bonsante's

domain $K(\tau)$ for τ. It can be deduced from [7] that this function is continuous with respect to the local Hausdorff topology, that is, if (τ_m) is a sequence of cocycles converging to τ_∞ then, for all $r > 0$,

$$K(\tau_m) \cap B_r(0) \to K(\tau_\infty) \cap B_r(0)$$

in the Hausdorff sense, where $B_r(0)$ here denotes the open ball of (euclidean) radius r about the origin in $\mathbb{R}^{d,1}$. Furthermore, all supporting hyperplanes to $K(\tau)$ are either spacelike or null and the intersection of $K(\tau)$ with any spacelike hyperplane is compact. It follows, in particular, that if (x_m) is a divergent sequence of boundary points of $K(\tau)$ and if, for all m, N_m is a unit, timelike supporting normal at the point x_m, then the sequence (N_m) also approaches the light cone as m tends to infinity.

At this stage, it is worthwhile to verify the existence of non-trivial examples of $\mathbb{R}^{d,1}$-cocycles and affine deformations. Indeed, although, in the $(2+1)$-dimensional case, large families of cocycles are obtained via the natural identification of $\mathbb{R}^{2,1}$-cocyles with tangent vectors to the Teichmüller space of the surface $\mathbb{H}^2/\Gamma$ (c.f. [15]), in higher dimensions, Mostow rigidity makes the problem of constructing non-trivial examples a good deal more subtle. One nice technique, however, involves interpreting cocycles as infinitesimal variations of the hyperbolic manifold $\mathbb{H}^d/\Gamma$ within the space of flat conformal manifolds. Indeed, consider the canonical injection

$$\theta_0 : \Gamma \to \mathrm{PSO}(d,1) \to \mathrm{PSO}(d+1,1),$$

and recall that any homomorphism $\theta : \Gamma \to \mathrm{PSO}(d+1,1)$ which is sufficiently close to θ_0 is the holonomy of some flat conformal structure over the manifold $\mathbb{H}^d/\Gamma$ (c.f. [19] and [24]). Suppose now that θ_0 extends to a non-trivial smooth family $(\theta_t)_{t\in]-\epsilon,\epsilon[}$ of homomorphisms of Γ into $\mathrm{PSO}(d+1,1)$. Then $\tilde{\tau} := \theta_0^{-1}(\partial_t\theta)_0$ defines a cocycle taking values in the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{so}(d+1,1)$. However, when the space $\mathfrak{so}(d+1,1)$ is considered as a representation of $\mathrm{PSO}(d,1)$ via the adjoint action, it naturally decomposes as

$$\mathfrak{so}(d+1,1) = \mathfrak{so}(d,1) \oplus \mathbb{R}^{d,1}.$$

In particular, since the first component of $\tilde{\tau}$ vanishes by Mostow rigidity, this map is entirely determined by its second component, which is the desired cocycle in $\mathbb{R}^{d,1}$. Finally, there are various known constructions of non-trivial, smooth families of flat conformal structures. The simplest involves bending a compact hyperbolic manifold around a totally geodesic hypersurface, whenever such a hypersurface exists (c.f. [16] and [18]). We refer the reader to [2], [17] and [22] for more details of this and other constructions.

We conclude this section by studying the case where the cocycle vanishes, which is known as the *fuchsian* case, and forms the starting point of our construction. In particular, Theorem 1.1.1 trivially holds in this case. Indeed, observe first that Bonsante's domain for the trivial cocycle $\tau = 0$ trivially coincides with the future cone C. Now, given $k \in]0,\infty[$, consider the hypersurface

$$\Sigma_k := \left\{ x \in C \mid \|x\|^2 = -1/k^2 \right\},$$

and observe that this hypersurface has constant scalar curvature equal to $(-k^2)$. Furthermore, the family $(\Sigma_k)_{k\in]0,\infty[}$ constitutes a smooth foliation of the interior of K. Indeed, if we define the smooth submersion $\phi : K^o \to]0,\infty[$ by

$$\phi(y) := \frac{-1}{\|y\|^2},$$

then, for all k, Σ_k is the level subset of ϕ at height k. Observe finally that (Σ_k) tends to ∂K in the local Hausdorff sense as k tends to $+\infty$. This foliation, which we henceforth refer to as the *fuchsian foliation*, will be of use at various stages in the sequel.

3.2 - Stability. Let $\Gamma \subseteq \mathrm{PSO}(3,1)$ be a kleinian subgroup, let $\tau : \Gamma_0 \to \mathbb{R}^{3,1}$ be a cocycle, and let $K := K(\tau)$ be Bonsante's domain for τ. For $k > 0$, let $\Sigma_k \subseteq K$ be a spacelike, locally strictly convex hypersurface in K of constant scalar curvature equal to $(-k^2)$ which is also invariant under the action of the group $\Gamma \ltimes \tau$. In this section, we study infinitesimal perturbations of Σ_k corresponding to infinitesimal variations of the cocycle τ.

First recall that, by the Gauss-Codazzi equations, the scalar curvature of Σ_k is given by

$$S := -\frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1\lambda_2 + \lambda_1\lambda_3 + \lambda_2\lambda_3),$$

where λ_1, λ_2 and λ_3 are the principal curvatures of Σ_k. The Jacobi operator of Σ_k then measures the infinitesimal variation of scalar curvature resulting from an infinitesimal normal perturbation of Σ_k. More formally, let $N : \Sigma_k \to \mathbb{R}^{3,1}$ be the future-oriented, unit normal vector field over Σ_k. For $f \in C_0^\infty(\Sigma_k)$, and for $t \in \mathbb{R}$, define

$$\Phi_{f,t}(x) := x + tf(x)N(x).$$

For any given x, and for sufficiently small t, $\Phi_{f,t}$ is also an embedding near x. In particular, letting $S_{f,t}(x)$ denote the scalar curvature of this embedding at the point x, we define

$$(Jf)(x) := \frac{\partial}{\partial t} S_{f,t}(x)\bigg|_{t=0},$$

and we call J the *Jacobi operator* of Σ_k.

Now let A be the shape operator of Σ_k. Since Σ_k is locally strictly convex, A is everywhere positive definite. Define B by

$$B := \frac{1}{3}\left(\mathrm{Tr}(A)\mathrm{Id} - A\right).$$

It is straightforward to see that B is also everywhere positive definite, and that

$$\mathrm{Tr}(BA) = 2k^2.$$

Lemma 3.2.1

The Jacobi operator of Σ_k is given by

$$Jf = B^{ij}A^2_{ij}f - B^{ij}f_{;ij},$$

where the summation convention is implied and $f_{;ij}$ here denotes the hessian of f along Σ_k.

Applying the maximum principle and the Fredholm alternative immediately yields

Corollary 3.2.2

The Jacobi operator of Σ_k is invertible.

Proof of Lemma 3.2.1: The following calculation is standard in the riemannian setting. We repeat it here in the lorentzian setting as care is required with signs that are different in certain places. Fix $f \in C^\infty(\Sigma_k)$. Define $I : \Sigma_k \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^{3,1}$ by

$$I(x,t) = x + tf(x)N(x).$$

Denote by g the pull-back through I of the Minkowski metric over $\mathbb{R}^{3,1}$. We extend N to a vector field over $\Sigma_k \times]-\epsilon, \epsilon[$ such that, for all (x,t), $N(x,t)$ is normal to the hypersurface, $\Sigma_k \times \{t\}$. Observe that, by definition, for all x

$$f(x,0)N(x,0) = \partial_t.$$

We claim that, along $\Sigma_k \times \{0\}$,

$$\nabla_{\partial_t} N = \nabla^\Sigma f.$$

Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_t \langle N, N\rangle = 0 \\ \Rightarrow \quad & \langle \nabla_{\partial_t} N, N\rangle = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Likewise, for any vector field U tangent to Σ_k and independent of t,

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_t \langle N, U\rangle = 0 \\ \Rightarrow \quad & \langle \nabla_{\partial_t} N, U\rangle = -\langle N, \nabla_{\partial_t} U\rangle \\ & \qquad\qquad = -\langle N, \nabla_U \partial_t\rangle \\ & \qquad\qquad = -\langle N, \nabla_U fN\rangle \\ & \qquad\qquad = \langle \nabla^\Sigma f, U\rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from the fact that $\langle N, N\rangle = -1$. This proves the assertion.

We now define the endomorphism field A over $\Sigma_k \times]-\epsilon, \epsilon[$ such that, for all (x,t), $(AN)(x,t) = 0$, and the restriction of $A(x,t)$ to the tangent space of $\Sigma_k \times \{t\}$ coincides with the shape operator of this hypersurface at this point. We are interested in the covariant

derivative of A in the time direction. Bearing in mind that $\mathbb{R}^{3,1}$ is flat, for any vector field U tangent to Σ_k and independent of time, we have

$$\begin{aligned}(\nabla_{\partial_t} A)U &= \nabla_{\partial_t}(AU) - A\nabla_{\partial_t} U \\ &= \nabla_{\partial_t}\nabla_U N - A\nabla_U \partial_t \\ &= \nabla_U \nabla_{\partial_t} N - A\nabla_U fN \\ &= \nabla_U \nabla^\Sigma f - fA^2 U.\end{aligned}$$

Finally, the scalar curvature of Σ_k is given by

$$S = \sigma(A) := -\frac{1}{6}\left(\mathrm{Tr}(A)^2 - \mathrm{Tr}(A^2)\right).$$

The derivative of the function σ at A is given by

$$DS(A)M = -B^{ij}M_{ij},$$

where the summation convention is implied, and the result now follows by the chain rule. □

Lemma 3.2.3

Let $(\tau_t)_{t\in]-\epsilon,\epsilon[}$ be a smoothly varying family of $\mathbb{R}^{3,1}$-cocycles such that $\tau_0 = \tau$. Upon reducing ϵ if necessary, there exists a unique, smoothly varying family $(\Sigma_{k,t})_{t\in]-\epsilon,\epsilon[}$ of spacelike, locally strictly convex hypersurfaces such that, for all t, $\Sigma_{k,t}$ is of constant scalar curvature equal to $(-k^2)$ and is invariant under the action of $\Gamma \ltimes \tau_t$.

Proof: We first define a smooth family $(\Sigma'_{k,t})_{t\in]-\epsilon,\epsilon[}$ of spacelike, locally strictly convex hypersurfaces such that, for all t, the hypersurface $\Sigma'_{k,t}$ is invariant under the action of $\Gamma \ltimes \tau_t$ but does not necessarily satisfy the curvature condition. The desired family will then be obtained via a perturbation argument. In what follows, we identify Γ with the action of $\Gamma \ltimes \tau_0$ over Σ_0. Let $N : \Sigma_k \to \mathbb{R}^{3,1}$ be the future-oriented, unit, normal vector field over Σ_k. Let $\phi \in C_0^\infty(\Sigma_k)$ be a smooth, positive function of compact support such that, for all $x \in \Sigma_k$,

$$\sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma} \phi(\gamma(x)) = 1.$$

Define $e :]-\epsilon,\epsilon[\times\Sigma_k \to \mathbb{R}^{3,1}$ by

$$e_t(x) := e(x) + \sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma} \phi(\gamma(x))\left(\tau_t(\gamma^{-1}) - \tau_0(\gamma^{-1})\right),$$

and, for all t, denote $e_t := e(t,\cdot)$. By construction, for all t, $e_t(\Sigma_k)$ is invariant under the action of $\Gamma \ltimes \tau_t$ and, upon reducing ϵ if necessary, we may suppose furthermore that it is embedded. This yields the desired family.

For all t, let $N_t : \Sigma_k \to \mathbb{R}^{3,1}$ be the future-oriented, unit, normal vector field over e_t. Define $\Phi : C^\infty(\Sigma_k)\times]-\epsilon,\epsilon[\to C^\infty(\Sigma_k, \mathbb{R}^{3,1})$ by

$$\Phi_{f,t}(x) = e_t(x) + f(x)N_t(x).$$

Observe that if f is Γ-invariant, then $\Phi_{f,t}$ is $\Gamma \ltimes \tau_t$ equivariant for all t. Furthermore, for sufficiently small (f,t), $\Phi_{f,t}$ is an embedding. Let $C^\infty_{\rm inv}(\Sigma_k)$ denote the space of smooth functions over Σ_k that are Γ-invariant, and define $S : C^\infty_{\rm inv}(\Sigma_k)\times]-\epsilon,\epsilon[\to C^\infty_{\rm inv}(\Sigma_k)$ such that, for all sufficiently small (f,t), and for all x, $S_{f,t}(x)$ is the scalar curvature of the embedding $\Phi_{f,t}$ at the point x. Now, given (l,α), by defining the Hölder space $C^{l,\alpha}_{\rm inv}(\Sigma_k)$ in a similar manner, we see that the functional S extends continuously to a smooth map from $C^{l+2,\alpha}_{\rm inv}(\Sigma_k)\times]-\epsilon,\epsilon[$ into $C^{l,\alpha}_{\rm inv}(\Sigma_k)$. Furthermore, its partial derivative with respect to the first component at the point $(0,0)$ is simply the Jacobi operator J. Since J is invertible, it follows by the implicit function theorem for maps between Banach manifolds that, upon reducing ϵ if necessary, there exists a smooth map $\phi :]-\epsilon,\epsilon[\to C^{l+2,\alpha}_{\rm inv}(\Sigma_k)$ such that, for all t, $\Phi_{\phi(t),t}(\Sigma_k)$ has constant scalar curvature equal to $(-k^2)$. Furthermore, by elliptic regularity, these surfaces are smooth for all t, and this completes the proof. $\Box$

3.3 - Compactness. We first obtain an elementary result concerning the position of a constant scalar curvature hypersurface inside a given GHMC Minkowski spacetime. As before, let $\Gamma \subseteq {\rm PSO}(3,1)$ be a cocompact, torsion free lattice, let $\tau : \Gamma \to \mathbb{R}^{3,1}$ be a cocycle, and let $K := K(\tau)$ be Bonsante's domain for τ. For $r > 0$, let K_r denote the set of all points of K lying at a (timelike) distance of at least $1/r$ from the boundary ∂K. For $k > 0$, let $\Sigma_k \subseteq K$ be a spacelike, locally strictly convex hypersurface of constant scalar curvature equal to $(-k^2)$ which is invariant under the action of $\Gamma \ltimes \tau$, and let Σ_k^+ denote the future-complete, convex set bounded by Σ_k.

Lemma 3.3.1

$K_k \subseteq \Sigma_k^+ \subseteq K$.

Proof: Let x be a point of ∂K. For all $\epsilon > 0$, denote $x(\epsilon) := x + \epsilon e_4$, where e_4 here denotes the fourth canonical basis vector of $\mathbb{R}^{3,1}$, and let $C_{x(\epsilon)}$ be the future cone based on $x(\epsilon)$. Define $\phi : C^o_{x(\epsilon)} \to]0,\infty[$ by

$$\phi(y) = \frac{-1}{\|y - x(\epsilon)\|^2},$$

and observe that the level sets of ϕ are simply the leaves of the fuchsian foliation of $C^o_{x(\epsilon)}$ which was introduced in Section 3.1. In particular, for all $y \in C^o_{x(\epsilon)}$, the level set of ϕ passing through the point y has constant scalar curvature equal to $\phi(y)$. Since Σ_k is $\Gamma \ltimes \tau$ invariant, its intersection with $C_{x(\epsilon)}$ is relatively compact, so that ϕ attains a minimum value at some point y, say, of this intersection. At this point, Σ_k is an interior tangent to the leaf of curvature $\phi(y)$ so that, by the geometric maximum principle, $k^2 \leq \phi(y)$. In particular, Σ_k has trivial intersection with the set $\phi^{-1}(]0,k[)$, and the result follows by letting ϵ tend to 0 and taking the union over all $x \in \partial K$. $\Box$

Consider now a sequence (k_m) of positive real numbers, and a sequence (τ_m) of cocycles. For all m, let $K_m := K(\tau_m)$ be Bonsante's domain for τ_m, and let $\Sigma_{k,m} \subseteq K_m$ be a spacelike, locally strictly convex hypersurface of constant scalar curvature equal to $(-k_m^2)$ which is invariant under the action of $\Gamma \ltimes \tau_m$. Suppose that (k_m) and (τ_m) converge to k_∞ and τ_∞ respectively. In particular (K_m) converges in the local Hausdorff sense to $K_\infty := K(\tau_\infty)$.

Lemma 3.3.2

For every compact subset X of $\mathbb{R}^{3,1}$, there exists a compact subset Y of $\mathbb{H}^3$ such that, for any m, and for any point x of $\Sigma_m \cap X$, if $N(x)$ is the future-oriented, unit normal vector of Σ_m at this point, then $N(x)$ is an element of Y.

Proof: Suppose the contrary. There exists a sequence (x_m) such that, for all m, $x_m \in \Sigma_m \cap X$ but such that $(N_m(x_m))$ diverges. Since Γ is cocompact, upon composing with suitable elements of $\Gamma \ltimes \tau_m$, we may suppose instead that the sequence $(N_m(x_m))$ remains within some fixed compact set, but that the sequence (x_m) diverges. For all m, denote $\overline{K}_m := K_m - x_m$, $\overline{K}_{m,k_m} := K_{m,k_m} - x_m$ and $\overline{\Sigma}^+_m := \Sigma^+_m - x_m$. Since (K_m) converges towards (K_∞), we may suppose that both $(\overline{K}_m)$ and $(\overline{K}_{m,k_m})$ converge in the local Hausdorff sense to the future side of the same null hyperplane H, say. Furthermore, since $\overline{K}_{m,k_m} \subseteq \overline{\Sigma}^+_m \subseteq \overline{K}_m$, $(\overline{\Sigma}^+_m)$ also converges to the future side of H. However, by compactness, we may suppose that N_m converges towards some limit N_∞, say. In particular, this vector is a supporting normal to H at the origin. This is absurd, since H is null, and the result follows. $\square$

Lemma 3.3.3

There exists a spacelike, locally strictly convex hypersurface Σ_∞ towards which Σ_m subconverges in the C^∞_{loc} sense.

Proof: Upon rescaling, we may suppose that $k_m = -1/3$ for all m. Furthermore, by Lemma 3.3.2, the sequence (Σ_m) is uniformly spacelike over every compact set. Since the scalar curvature is an elliptic curvature function (c.f. [11] and [23]), it now suffices to show that for every compact subset X of $\mathbb{R}^{d,1}$, there exists $B > 0$ such that, for all m, the shape operator A_m of Σ_m satisfies

$$\frac{1}{B} \leq A_m(x) \leq B,$$

for all $x \in \Sigma_m \cap X$. Furthermore since, for all m, Σ_m has constant scalar curvature equal to $(-1/3)$, it suffices to prove the lower bound. Now suppose the contrary, so that there exists a sequence of points (x_m) contained within some compact set X, say, and a sequence (λ_m) of positive real numbers converging to zero such that, for all m, x_m is an element of Σ_m, and λ_m is an eigenvalue of the shape operator of Σ_m at this point.

For all m, let N_m be the future-oriented, unit, normal vector field over Σ_m, and define

$$\hat{\Sigma}_m := \{(x, N_m(x)) \mid x \in \Sigma_m\}, \text{ and}$$
$$\hat{x}_m := (x_m, N_m(x_m)).$$

By Lemma 2.4.1, for all m, $\hat{\Sigma}_m$ is a complete, positive, special legendrian submanifold of $M := \mathrm{U}^+\mathbb{R}^{3,1}$ with $\Theta = \pi/2$. Furthermore, by Lemma 3.3.2, the sequence $(\hat{x}_m)$ is contained in a compact subset of M. It follows by Theorem 2.4.2 that there exists a complete, pointed, positive, special legendrian submanifold $(\hat{\Sigma}_\infty, \hat{x}_\infty)$ towards which $(\hat{\Sigma}_m, \hat{x}_m)$ subconverges.

Since the least eigenvalue of the shape operator of Σ_m at the point x_m tends to zero, $\hat{\Sigma}_\infty$ is degenerate at $\hat{x}_\infty$ so that, by Theorem 2.6.3, $\hat{\Sigma}_\infty$ is a curtain submanifold. It follows

by Theorem 2.7.2 that $\hat{\Sigma}_\infty = N\Gamma_\infty$ for some complete geodesic Γ_∞ in $\mathbb{H}^3$. In particular, its projection onto $\mathbb{R}^{3,1}$ contains a complete, spacelike plane P, say, which must be contained in K_∞. However, since the intersection of K_∞ with any spacelike hyperplane is compact, this is absurd, and the result follows. □

3.4 - Existence and uniqueness. We now prove the main result of this paper.

Theorem 3.4.1

Let $\Gamma \subseteq PSO(3,1)$ be a kleinian subgroup. Let $\tau : \Gamma \to \mathbb{R}^{d,1}$ be an $\mathbb{R}^{3,1}$-cocycle. Let $K := K(\tau)$ be Bonsante's domain for τ. For all $k > 0$, there exists a unique, spacelike, locally strictly convex hypersurface Σ_k in K which is of constant scalar curvature equal to $(-k^2)$ and which is invariant under the action of $\Gamma \ltimes \tau$. Furthermore, the family $(\Sigma_k)_{k>0}$ constitutes a smooth foliation of the interior of K.

Proof: We first prove existence. Thus, let $I \subseteq [0,1]$ be the set of all $t \in [0,1]$ such that the existence part of the result holds for the cocycle $t\tau$. By Lemmas 3.2.3 and 3.3.3, I is both open and closed. The fuchsian case described at the end of Section 3.1 shows that 0 is an element of I so that, by connectedness, 1 is also an element of I, and existence follows.

In fact, it follows from Lemmas 3.2.1 and 3.3.3 that the number of such hypersurfaces is finite and independent of both k and τ. However, uniqueness can also be proven more directly as follows. Let Σ_k be a spacelike, locally strictly convex hypersurface in K of constant scalar curvature equal to $(-k^2)$ which is invariant under the action of $\Gamma \ltimes \tau$. For $t \in \mathbb{R}$, define $\Sigma_{k,t} := \Sigma_k + te_4$, where e_4 here denotes the fourth canonical basis element of $\mathbb{R}^{3,1}$. That is, $\Sigma_{k,t}$ is obtained by translating Σ_k vertically upwards by a distance of t. Since Σ_k is asymptotic to ∂K, the family $(\Sigma_{k,t})$ smoothly foliates $\mathbb{R}^{3,1}$. Now let Σ'_k be another hypersurface with the same properties as Σ_k. Since Σ'_k is also asymptotic to ∂K, there exists $t \in \mathbb{R}$ such that Σ'_k is an interior tangent to $\Sigma_{k,t}$ at some point, and it follows by the strong geometric maximum principle that these two hypersurfaces coincide. However, since both Σ_k and Σ'_k are asymptotic to ∂K, this is only possible when $t = 0$, and uniqueness follows.

We now prove that the family $(\Sigma_k)_{k>0}$ smoothly foliates the interior of K. Consider $k \in \mathbb{R}$. For l sufficiently close to k, Σ_l is the normal graph of some function f_l over Σ_k. Consider now the partial derivative,

$$g := \frac{\partial}{\partial l} f_l|_{l=k}.$$

By Lemma 3.2.1,

$$B^{ij} g_{;ij} = 1 + \phi g,$$

for some positive-definite matrix B^{ij} and some strictly positive function ϕ. It follows by the maximum principle that g is strictly negative and there therefore exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that $(\Sigma_l)_{l \in]k-\epsilon, k+\epsilon[}$ smoothly foliates a neighbourhood of Σ_k. Since this holds for all k, it follows that $(\Sigma_k)_{k>0}$ smoothly foliates some open subset of K.

It remains to show that this foliation covers the whole of the interior of K. However, by Lemma 3.3.1, Σ_k converges to ∂K as k tends to $+\infty$. On the other hand, for $t \in \mathbb{R}$ let C_t be the future cone based on the point te_4, where e_4 again denotes the fourth canonical

basis vector of $\mathbb{R}^{3,1}$. For t sufficiently large and negative, X is contained in C_t. Now let $(\Sigma'_k)_{k>0}$ be the fuchsian foliation of C_t constructed at the end of Section 3.1. By the geometric maximum principle, for all k, Σ_k lies above Σ'_k. From this it follows that $(\Sigma_k)_{k>0}$ foliates the whole of the interior of K, and this completes the proof. □

4 - Bibliography.

[1] Andersson L., Barbot T., Béguin F., Zeghib A., Cosmological time versus CMC time in spacetimes of constant curvature, *Asian Journal of Mathematics*, **16**, (2012), no. 1, 37–88

[2] Apanasov B. N., Deformations of conformal structures on hyperbolic manifolds, *J. Differential Geom.*, **35**, (1992), no. 1, 1–20

[3] Barbot T., Bonsante F., Schlenker J.-M., Collisions of particles in locally AdS spacetimes I. Local description and global examples, *Comm. Math. Phys.*, **308**, (2011), no. 1, 147–200

[4] Barbot T., Béguin F., Zeghib A., Prescribing Gauss curvature of surfaces in 3-dimensional spacetimes, Application to the Minkowski problem in the Minkowski space, *Ann. Instit. Fourier.*, **61**, (2011), no. 2, 511–591

[5] Bernal A. N., Sánchez M., On smooth Cauchy hypersurfaces and Gerochs splitting theorem, *Comm. Math. Phys.*, **243**, (2003), no. 3, 461–470

[6] Bernal A. N., Sánchez M., Globally hyperbolic spacetimes can be defined as causal instead of strongly causal, *Classical Quantum Gravity*, **24**, (2007), no. 3, 745–749

[7] Bonsante F., Flat spacetimes with compact hyperbolic Cauchy surfaces, *J. Differential Geom.*, **69**, (2005), no. 3, 441–521

[8] Bonsante F., Fillastre F., The equivariant Minkowski problem in Minkowski space, to appear in *Ann. Inst. Fourier*

[9] Bonsante F., Mondello G., Schlenker J.-M., A cyclic extension of the earthquake flow, *Geometry & Topology*, **17**, (2013), 157–234

[10] Bonsante F., Mondello G., Schlenker J.-M., A cyclic extension of the earthquake flow II, arXiv:1208.1738

[11] Caffarelli L., Nirenberg L., Spruck J., Nonlinear second-order elliptic equations. V. The Dirichlet problem for Weingarten hypersurfaces, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, **41**, (1988), no. 1, 47–70

[12] Carlip S., *Quantum gravity in* $2+1$ *dimensions*, Cambridge Monographs of Mathematical Physics, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, (1998)

[13] Fillastre F., Smith G., Group actions and scattering problems in Teichmueller theory, arXiv:1605.04563

[14] Gilbarg D., Trudinger N. S., *Elliptic partical differential equations of second order*, Die Grundlehren der mathemathischen Wissenschaften, **224**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, New York (1977)

[15] Goldman W. M., *Discontinuous groups and the Euler class*, PhD Thesis, University of California, Berkeley, 1980, 138 pp.

[16] Johnson D., Millson J. J., Deformation spaces associated to compact hyperbolic manifolds, *Discrete groups in geometry and analysis (New Haven, Conn., 1984)*, Progr. Math., vol. **67**, Birkhäauser Boston, Boston, MA, 1987, pp. 48–106

[17] Kapovich M., Deformations of representations of discrete subgroups of $\mathrm{SO}(3,1)$, *Math. Ann.*, **299**, (1994), no. 2, 341–354

[18] Kourouniotis C., Deformations of hyperbolic structures, *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, **98**, (1985), no. 2, 247–261

[19] Kulkarni R.S., Pinkall U., A canonical metric for Möbius structures and its applications, *Math. Z.*, **216**, (1994), no.1, 89–129

[20] Labourie F., Un lemme de Morse pour les surfaces convexes, *Invent. Math.*, **141**, (2000), no. 2, 239–297

[21] Mess G., Lorentz spacetimes of constant curvature, *Geom. Dedicata*, **126**, (2007), 3–45

[22] Scannell K. P., Infinitesimal deformations of some $\mathrm{SO}(3,1)$ lattices, *Pacific J. Math.*, **194**, (2000), no. 2, 455–464

[23] Rosenberg H., Smith G., Degree Theory of Immersed Hypersurfaces, arXiv:1010.1879

[24] Smith G., Moduli of Flat Conformal Structures of Hyperbolic Type, *Geom. Dedicata*, **154**, (2011), no. 1, 47–80

[25] Smith G., Special Lagrangian curvature, Math. Annalen, **335**, (2013), no. 1, 57–95

[26] Spruck J., Xiao L., Convex Spacelike Hypersurfaces of Constant Curvature in de Sitter Space, arXiv:1203.5739